



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/409,305	09/29/1999	CRAIG D. ULLMAN	2050.132US1	5182

44367 7590 01/05/2011  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/OPEN TV  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938

EXAMINER
----------

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/05/2011

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com  
request@slwip.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* CRAIG D. ULLMAN, MICHAEL R. ABATO,  
JEFFREY M. HARRINGTON, and CARL R. DUDA

---

Appeal 2010-002914  
Application 09/409,305  
Technology Center 2400

---

Before JOSEPH L. DIXON, JEAN R. HOMERE, and STEPHEN C. SIU,  
*Administrative Patent Judges.*

DIXON, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

ERRATUM

The November 19, 2010 decision to the above captioned appeal erroneously identified claim 170 as being affirmed/sustained under the “V. ANALYSIS” heading on page 7 of the Decision where we stated “[t]herefore, we will sustain the rejection of independent claim 149 and independent claim 158, 164, 170, and 175 grouped therewith since Appellants have not set forth separate arguments for patentability.” We later addressed, on pages 7-9 of the Decision, Appellants’ arguments with respect

to claim 170 and stated “[t]herefore, we are left to speculate as to the application of the prior art teachings. Therefore, we find that the Examiner has not met the initial burden to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness with respect to claims 170, 171, and 174, and we must reverse the Examiner's rejection thereof.” Thus, the reference to claim 170 on page 7 was in error. The status of the claims set forth in the “VI. CONCLUSION” and “VII. ORDER” sections are correct.

All other portions of the November 19, 2010 Decision remain unchanged.

Any timelines prescribed by the original November 19, 2010 Decision remain unchanged. If there are any questions pertaining to this erratum, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

msc

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/OPEN TV  
P.O. BOX 2938  
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-0938